

EXHIBIT 4

Email Exchange with the Defendants Regarding Jurisdictional Discovery

RE: inquiry per motion for jurisdictional discovery pertaining to remand

From: Sonneborn, Daniel R. (dsonneborn@preti.com)

To: quickquantum@aol.com; elanders@morrisonmahoney.com; lsmith@morrisonmahoney.com

Date: Monday, December 11, 2023 at 04:49 PM EST

Andre,

I do not believe it is necessary to conduct jurisdictional discovery as to the Hilliard defendants.

Dan

Daniel R. Sonneborn
Director
PretiFlaherty

From: Andre Bisasor <quickquantum@aol.com>

Sent: Monday, December 11, 2023 4:39 PM

To: Landers, Edwin <elanders@morrisonmahoney.com>; Smith, Linda <lsmith@morrisonmahoney.com>; Sonneborn, Daniel R. <DSonneborn@preti.com>

Subject: Re: inquiry per motion for jurisdictional discovery pertaining to remand

Note: * This email originated from outside of Preti. Please do not click on any links or open attachments unless you can verify the sender and content.*****

Dan,

to be clear and so there is no misunderstanding, the donais defendants stated below that they do not think jurisdictional discovery is needed from the Donais defendants. They have not taken a position on whether it is needed from the Hilliard defendants. I understand from your reply below that you agree it is not needed from the donais defendants, i.e., given the way it is worded. But it is not clear if you think it is needed from the Hilliard defendants, I ask this also in light of the fact that the Hilliard defendants are the ones who effected removal and given the dispute over when the service documents were received by Hilliard and given my challenge to the diversity of the partners/member of the Upton & Hatfield law firm.

Can you please specifically reply to clarify this?

Andre

On Monday, December 11, 2023 at 04:17:22 PM EST, Sonneborn, Daniel R. <dsonneborn@preti.com> wrote:

Andre,

I do not agree that it is needed and thus do not concur either. Thanks.

Dan

Daniel R. Sonneborn
Director
617.226.3852 Tel

dsonneborn@preti.com
[Bio](#) | [LinkedIn](#) | [Twitter](#) | [preti.com](#)

PretiFlaherty
60 State Street
Suite 1100
Boston, MA 02109

From: Andre Bisasor <quickquantum@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, December 11, 2023 4:15 PM
To: Landers, Edwin <elanders@morrisonmahoney.com>; Smith, Linda <LSmith@morrisonmahoney.com>
Cc: Sonneborn, Daniel R. <DSonneborn@preti.com>
Subject: Re: inquiry per motion for jurisdictional discovery pertaining to remand

Note: *** This email originated from outside of Preti. Please do not click on any links or open attachments unless you can verify the sender and content.***

Dan, could you please reply to my email?

Thanks,
Andre

On Monday, December 11, 2023 at 03:37:39 PM EST, Smith, Linda <LSmith@morrisonmahoney.com> wrote:

The Donais Defendants do not agree that jurisdictional discovery is needed from them. To the extent you plan to file a motion seeking jurisdictional discovery from the Donais Defendants, the Donais Defendants do not concur.

Linda Smith

Partner

MORRISON MAHONEY LLP
650 Elm Street, Suite 201
Manchester, NH 03101
T (603) 518-1971 | F (603) 622-3466
LSmith@morrisonmahoney.com | www.morrisonmahoney.com

Connecticut | Massachusetts | New Hampshire | New Jersey | New York | Rhode Island | United Kingdom

The information transmitted, including attachments, is intended only for the person(s) or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmissions, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error, please contact the sender and destroy any copies of this information.

From: Andre Bisasor <quickquantum@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, December 11, 2023 1:03 PM
To: Smith, Linda <LSmith@morrisonmahoney.com>; Landers, Edwin <ELanders@morrisonmahoney.com>

Cc: Daniel R. Sonneborn <dsonneborn@preti.com>

Subject: Re: inquiry per motion for jurisdictional discovery pertaining to remand

External Email from Andre Bisasor <quickquantum@aol.com>. Do not click on links, open attachments, or reply before confirming this is a valid email.

correction:

Dear All,

Based on prior indications in **one** place or form or another, I believe you have stated or signaled **(or otherwise I believe it can be inferred)** that you do not concur with any motion for jurisdictional discovery pertaining to remand. If I am incorrect, please let me know.

Thanks,

Andre Bisasor

On Monday, December 11, 2023 at 01:01:07 PM EST, Andre Bisasor <quickquantum@aol.com> wrote:

Dear All,

Based on prior indications in place or form or another, I believe you have stated or signaled that you do not concur with any motion for jurisdictional discovery pertaining to remand. If I am incorrect, please let me know.

Thanks,

Andre Bisasor

This E-Mail may contain information that is privileged, confidential and / or exempt from discovery or disclosure under applicable law. Unintended transmission shall not constitute waiver of the attorney-client or any other privilege. If you are not the intended recipient of this communication, and have

received it in error, please do not distribute it and notify me immediately by E-mail at dsonneborn@preti.com or via telephone at 617.226.3800 and delete the original message. Unless expressly stated in this e-mail, nothing in this message or any attachment should be construed as a digital or electronic signature or as a legal opinion.

This E-Mail may contain information that is privileged, confidential and / or exempt from discovery or disclosure under applicable law. Unintended transmission shall not constitute waiver of the attorney-client or any other privilege. If you are not the intended recipient of this communication, and have received it in error, please do not distribute it and notify me immediately by E-mail at dsonneborn@preti.com or via telephone at 617.226.3800 and delete the original message. Unless expressly stated in this e-mail, nothing in this message or any attachment should be construed as a digital or electronic signature or as a legal opinion.